



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,742	11/26/2003	Janaki Kumar	13906-148001 / 2003P00828	9947
32864 7590 12/27/2006 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,742	Applicant(s) KUMAR ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory J. Vaughn	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13,15,16,18-25,27,28 and 31-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13,15,16,18-25,27,28 and 31-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/10/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Action Background

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/11/2006.
2. With the amendment filed 10/11/2006, applicant has canceled claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 26, 29 and 30; amended claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27, 28 and 31-36; and added new claims 37-38.
3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27, 28 and 31-39 are pending in the case, claims 1, 13 and 25 are independent claims.
4. Acknowledgement is made to the applicant's submission of an Information Disclosure Statement, filed 10/10/2006.
5. Acknowledgement is made to the applicant's submission of replacement drawings on 10/10/2006.
6. Applicant has amended the specification in response to the objections cited by the examiner in the *Drawings* and *Specification* sections of the previous office action (dated 4/7/2006). Applicant's amendment has addressed the objections previously made, and therefore, in view of the amendment, objections to the drawings and specification are withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Examiner's rejection of claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 26, 29 and 30, made under 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a) as recited in the previous office action (dated 4/7/2006) is withdrawn in view of the cancelled claims.
8. Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 13, and 25, made under 35 USC 102(e) in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102* section of the previous office action (dated 4/7/2006) is withdrawn as necessitated by the amended claims.
9. Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4, 6-12, 15, 16, 18-24, 27, 28 and 31-36, made under 35 USC 103(a) in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103* section of the previous office action (dated 4/7/2006) is withdrawn as necessitated by the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made."

11. Claims 1, 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi, US Patent Publication 2003/0187876, filed 3/19/2003, published 10/2/2003 in view of Zak et al., US patent 5,265,207, filed 4/8/1993, patented

11/23/1993 (hereinafter Zak) and in further view of Bornemisza-Wahr et al., US Patent 6,073,119, filed 12/3/1997, patented 6/6/2000 (hereinafter Wahr).

12. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Ohnishi discloses a customer interaction center system. Ohnishi recites: *"One object of the present invention is to provide a office counter work supporting system that can support an operator in his/her office counter work by properly providing to the operator various information on each customer"* (paragraph 11). Ohnishi discloses presenting a single user interface, which includes a work area with customer information (see Figure 6A), and a message area (see Figure 6C).

Ohnishi discloses the electronic messages are sent from a supervisor. Ohnishi recites: *"The CI server 33 accommodates a CRM (Customer Relationship Management) application to acquire and use various information stored in the mini MCIF database 32, a sales support application to obtain advice, from a supervisor"* (paragraph 62). See also Figure 6C, wherein the message says: *"Mind Your Language"*. Ohnishi fails to disclose the message from the supervisor as a broadcast message. However, broadcasting a message from one user to multiple other users is well known in the art. A broadcast from a supervisor is similarly well known in the art. Zak discloses a broadcast message from a supervisor in lines 43-59 of column 21. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the customer interaction center of Ohnishi with the broadcast message teachings of Zak in order to *"facilitate transfer of the message to destination processors"* (Zak, abstract).

Ohnishi fails to disclose the message as an automatically scrolling/moving text. Scrolling/moving text is well known in the art. For instance, consider the moving text of a financial ticker-tape display. Wahr disclose this type of moving text related to an information center in Figure 7 at reference sign 34. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the customer interaction center with supervisor broadcast capabilities of Ohnishi and Zak with the moving text teachings of Wahr in order to "provide users with video information displays" (Wahr, column 2, lines 18-19).

13. **Regarding claims 13 and 25**, the claims are directed toward a system and machine-readable media, respectively, for the method of claim 1, and are rejected using the same rationale.
14. Claims 3, 4, 6-12, 15, 16, 18-24 27, 28 and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Zak, in view of Wahr and in view of Corneille et al. US Patent Publication 2005/0075115, filed 10/7/2003, published 4/7/2005 (hereinafter Corneille).
15. **Regarding dependent claims 3 and 4**, Ohnishi discloses a customer system with an interface having a work area and a message area as described above. Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr fail to disclose the message with a priority indicator (claim 3) or displaying the messages according to a priority (claim 4). However Corneille teaches specific message functionality, including priority indicators in customer service systems. Corneille is directed toward providing customer service. Corneille

recites: *"allow an end-user to call a customer service center, through which long-term provisioning can be obtained for the mobile device"* (paragraph 8).

Corneille discloses the use of full function messaging systems that include the use of priority indicators. Corneille recites: *"End users may set their preferences for email-driven notifications using a rules engine that may come with the email client on their laptop/desktop computer. One common rules engine may be found in Outlook 2000 and Lotus Notes, both of which allow users to establish a wide variety of rules. Outlook's Rules Wizard allows users to be notified when they receive any message, a message from a specific person or distribution list, a high priority message, a message with specific words in the subject or body, a message sent only to the end user, a message where the user is in the To:, a message where the user is in the CC:, etc. It also allows the end user to specify up to 24 different exceptions (i.e.--don't forward notes with attachments) to further filter message about which they are notified"* (paragraph 146).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill, at the time the invention was made to combine the messaging functionality of Corneille with the customer interface of Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr in order to: *'set up and manage end-users for a specific service'* (Corneille, paragraph 14).

16. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Ohnishi discloses a customer system with an interface having a work area and a message area as described above. Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr fail to explicitly describe control of the scroll capabilities with a cursor, however messages with scrolling capabilities are well known in the art. For example,

Corneille discloses Outlook 2000 and Lotus Notes, which both incorporate messages that are scroll enabled. In fact, in the art of GUI development, a text object (like a message) is typically displayed in a text box, which has controls that enable scrolling features when the amount of text is more than the size of the text box (vertical and horizontal scrolling enablement are frequently an artistic design consideration). Corneille discloses an example of such a text box in Figure 22 at reference sign 2212.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill, at the time the invention was made to combine the messaging functionality of Corneille with the customer interface of Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr in order to: *'set up and manage end-users for a specific service'* (Corneille, paragraph 14).

17. **Regarding dependent claims 7-12**, Ohnishi discloses a customer system with an interface having a work area and a message area as described above. Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr fail to explicitly describe the message with status control capabilities, wherein if the message has a new status, it is added to the message area (claim 7), if the message has a read status, it is removed from the message area (claim 8), if the message has an expired status, it is removed from the message area (claim 9), being able to manually control message status information (claim 10), using the mouse to control message status information (claim 11), and the ability to sort messages based on the status information (claim 12). However these message controls are well known in the art. As Corneille states above, Outlook 2000 and Lotus notes disclose the claimed message functionality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill, at the time the invention was made to combine the messaging functionality of Corneille with the customer interface of Ohnishi, Zak and Wahr in order to: '*set up and manage end-users for a specific service*' (Corneille, paragraph 14).

18. **Regarding claims 15, 16, 18-24, 27, 28 and 31-36**, the claims are directed toward a system and machine-readable media, respectively, for the method of claims 3, 4 and 6-12, respectively, and are rejected using the same rationale.
19. **Regarding new claims 37-39**, Ohnishi discloses a work area and message area that are simultaneously viewable in Figures 6A and 6C.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, 18-25, 27, 28 and 31-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as described above.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn
Patent Examiner
December 22, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen Hong', with a stylized, sweeping flourish extending from the end.

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER